

small part the result of an American non-proliferation policy so disjointed and concessionary that it was prone to be disregarded and misread.

White House officials admit they were caught flat-footed, that the Central Intelligence Agency failed to provide adequate warning of the tests. To press this point, however, is to miss the warning the Administration had months earlier: the winter election of the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party, which had long championed India's right to nuclear weapons.

What did the White House do with this warning? It sent its United Nations Ambassador, Bill Richardson, to India to emphasize the importance of issues other than non-proliferation (lest it sour relations) as well as the chairman of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Shirley Ann Jackson, to emphasize our desire for expanded nuclear cooperation.

Not surprisingly, the Indian press interpreted these visits in the worst way possible. The United States, it argued, has finally gotten over its preoccupation with blocking India's rightful development of strategic technology. What's unclear is when, if at all, American officials bothered to brief leaders of the Bharatiya Janata Party about the sanctions that the White House would be forced to impose if India followed through on its pledge.

What can we do now? The White House should immediately impose the sanctions called for in the Nuclear Proliferation Prevention Act of 1994, rather than bargain for some new pledge of restraint.

Indian officials speculate that the United States may not impose sanctions or that if it does they will have little effect. We must prove them wrong. In fact, the value of the Indian stock market had already fallen by 5 percent by Tuesday in anticipation of sanctions. The Indian financial market understands what sanctions will mean to the banks, which are seriously overextended and undercapitalized.

By Indian law, at least 51 percent of the shares of every bank are owned by the Government. Under the American nonproliferation law, no United States bank, public or private, can make loans or extend credit to these institutions for at least one year. Carrying out the sanctions would hurt. But it would strengthen the hand of Indians who understand that their nation can best compete against China by being economically powerful and that without such strength, a military competition of the sort now being undertaken will be disastrous.

Certainly, the world is watching including Pakistan (whose financial and political institutions can even less afford an American financial cut-off). It the White House is to have any chance of having its commitment to nonproliferation taken seriously, its sanctions must be seen as something more than a bluff. Pakistan, at the least, must understand it has much more to lose than gain by testing.

Congress and the White House must also use the Indian tests to revise our overly generous, a la carte nonproliferation policies. We must recognize that the case of India is related to those of China and North Korea; our catering to both these nations' demands for military-related technology—whether it be for missile or nuclear goods—is a prescription for more proliferation. Indeed, the White House has smothered these nations and Russia with all manner of nuclear and space assistance (actually subsidizing known proliferators like China's Great Wall Industries, the Chinese National Nuclear Corporation and the Russian Space Agency with licensed American technology).

But what the United States has all too scrupulously avoided is the use of any

sticks—from enforcing sanctions against China and Russia, to penalizing Russian investments in Iran's oil industry, to keeping our military and diplomats from purposeful action against Iraq, to holding North Korea responsible for its continued violation of the global Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. This and the continued American export of high technology to known proliferators must end.

Finally, we need to be more confident. We always have plenty of warning, if we are willing to act on less than conclusive proof of a completed weapons program. And we have plenty of options to deter proliferation, assuming we're willing to act early enough.

ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is recognized for 50 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to come before my colleagues and the American people to talk about an issue that is finally gaining the attention of policymakers here in Washington, and that is the need to eliminate the marriage penalty in our Tax Code system.

What is the marriage penalty? Essentially, it is the way in which our Federal income tax operates that says to more than 21 million couples, you are going to pay, on average, \$1,400 more each year simply because you are married.

It comes up in a lot of different provisions. Married people have less of a personal deduction. Married couples pay higher rates on much of their income. So oftentimes what happens is that when two young people get married, they are both working, they both earn an income, maybe receive a little bit of a return on April 15 when they do their taxes. As soon as they get married, they get hit with this marriage penalty and suddenly have to pay more taxes.

Then it is carried throughout their lives if, as adults, they start having children and save money so that they can invest in a savings account for their children to go to college. When they take that savings account back out, they get hit with another marriage penalty.

And then, finally, when they retire, many, many senior citizens are hit with a penalty on their Social Security because they remarry in their later years of their life.

What our bill does is eliminates the penalty in the Tax Code, and I have been talking about this issue for the last year. JERRY WELLER and I introduced a bill last fall that would eliminate it, and I have urged people to contact me at my web site www.house.gov/McIntosh and talk to me about how the marriage penalty affects them.

We have literally received hundreds of e-mails from people all around the country saying how the marriage penalty has hurt them after their wedding.

One person told me that they had postponed their honeymoon and were expecting to go this year; but when the tax bill came on April 15, they owed more money because of this marriage penalty, had to once again forego their honeymoon; and the young lady's husband would not be able to go to summer school to finish some of his classes, all because the government punishes marriage in this country.

I first learned about this when two of my constituents wrote to me last year, Sharon Mallory and Darryl Pierce. Sharon and Darryl, pictured here in this picture, wrote to me and talked about what the marriage penalty meant in their lives. Sharon works for about \$10 an hour at a Ford electronics plant in Connersville, Indiana, and Darryl works there as well, does a little farming on the side. They want to get married, and they went to H&R Block and asked the accountant, "What will happen to us if we get married?"

□ 1815

The accountant explained to Sharon that not only would she have to give up her \$900 tax refund, together they would be penalized \$2,800, just because they got married.

Sharon went on in her letter and told me, "We can't afford it. It breaks our heart, but we can't afford to get married. I urge you, Congressman, to eliminate this marriage penalty."

Well, it broke my heart when I received her letter, and I started researching exactly how comprehensive is this marriage penalty. I found out that 21 million families in America pay on average \$1,400 extra taxes just because they are married.

Now, many of the people in this country are saying we need to strengthen families, we need to be on the side of families, families are the organization in our society that are raising our children, teaching them the moral values they need in order to become future citizens. And today families truly are under assault. You not only have the marriage penalty, you have problems with drugs and gangs, problems with different images that are exposed to the families being broken down, and too often we see families where there is no father involved with the children.

I am not saying that a single mom is not loving her children as much as possible. My mom was a single mom, and I know all the sacrifices she made for me, but we were always hoping we would have had there.

The consequences of not having an intact family can be tremendous. Studies show that children who come from split homes or single parent homes are more likely to divorce themselves. They are four times as likely to die at an earlier age. Their health is worse.

Sadly, many of them pass on these problems to the next generation. Seventy-two percent of juvenile murders come from divided homes. Sixty percent of rapists grew up in broken

homes. They are more likely to use drugs, more likely to commit suicide and more likely to drop out of school.

We have to reverse that, and we can start by putting the Federal Government on the side of families, eliminating the marriage penalty, saying to parents, we are going to give you a break. We know it is tough when both mom and dad have to work just to pay all the bills and make ends meet. We do not want to make it worse for you by having the government every April 15 take out \$1,400 more in your taxes.

So, as Congress considers the budget, which will be coming up later this week, we have received a commitment from the Committee on the Budget that we will put eliminating the marriage penalty at the top of our priorities for tax cuts. \$100 billion of tax cuts are written into that budget, and this tax cut will say to those families, we are finally going to be on your side. We are going to eliminate the marriage penalty; we are going to make it our number one priority.

Now, the way to do this is through legislation that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. RILEY) and I introduced. It is H.R. 3734, the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Act.

What it does is it says, quite simply, in two areas we are going to redress the penalty. If you are a single person and you get a deduction of \$4,100, when you marry you are going to continue to get that same deduction and your wife is going to get the same deduction. So when you file married, you do not end up being penalized on that personal standard deduction.

The second way in which we help families is to say if you are making \$24,000 and are taxed at the 15 percent rate, and your wife is making \$24,000 and is taxed at that 15 percent rate, today when you get married, suddenly part of that income, about \$8,000 of it, is taxed at the higher rate, at 28 percent. Our bill would eliminate that and say when you are single, the cutoff in the brackets is \$24,650. For married people, it is going to be exactly double that. We eliminate the inequity that says just because you are going to get married, you are going to slip into a higher tax bracket.

It is time that we pass this bill as part of our budget and move forward next fall in the tax bill that we send to the American people, and that this Congress comes squarely on the side of the American family and says, once and for all, we are going to eliminate the marriage penalty, so Sharon and Darryl can get married and not have to worry about how to make ends meet on their family budget.

Tonight, many of us wanted to come forward and talk about this issue and what we plan to do with it in Congress. I would like to recognize one of my colleagues, a Member who came to us in the class of 1994, who has done a great job of representing Florida, (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to commend the gentleman not only for convening this special order on this very important issue, but as well for being one of the leaders in the Congress and introducing H.R. 3734, the legislation to repeal the marriage tax penalty.

I believe the institution of marriage was ordained by God. If you travel all over the world, it is very obvious that it is a universal institution, and its obvious primary function is to be the place where new citizens, future citizens, are nourished and raised up and learn to become contributors to society. I am talking, obviously, there about our children.

To have provisions within our Tax Code, to have provisions within the law of the Government of the United States that discourage marriage and encourage people to live outside of wedlock, to me is almost criminal. To allow the very existence of this marriage tax penalty to develop in our Tax Code to me is an offense, not only to the American people, but as well to common sense.

Prior to getting elected to Congress I practiced medicine. I am a physician by training. I was able to see this firsthand, and I remember it very well, seeing people, particularly senior citizens, often who were widowed and living together out of wedlock, setting a terrible example for their children and their grandchildren. But like the couple in your district that you mentioned, they were doing so primarily because of the tax burden that they would face if they were to walk down the aisle and get married.

I have to say it literally breaks my heart that we have to actually fight here in Washington, D.C. for these kinds of common sense reforms. To me, the people back home described this to me as being a no-brainer, but yet we have to struggle and fight and argue.

But I am very, very pleased that we have a commitment from the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, we have the vast majority of our Republican Conference strongly behind this, and we even have some of the Democrats getting behind this, which is always refreshing when you are talking about reducing taxes and we see Democrats standing up for that, and I want to commend the gentleman again.

Let me just add, the points that the gentleman made about the impact on children, this is another reason why this is so critical, because if you look at what is the primary indicator for health in a community in terms of issues like drug abuse, issues like illiteracy, juvenile crime, the liberals will tell you, oh, it is income, and in reality it is not income. The thing that correlates most with problems like drug abuse, declining educational scores and juvenile delinquency, it is actually the amount of fatherlessness in that community. It is actually an intact family that is the best indicator of the health of that community.

To have a Tax Code that is actually encouraging people not to get married, to me it is crazy. I strongly commend the gentleman, and I do hope that all of our colleagues will support this effort.

Now, it will come at a price. It will cost us, the Federal Government, money to get rid of the marriage penalty. But, amazingly, as I understand it, it will mean a reduction in spending of 1 percent over the next 5 years, which to me is a price well worth paying. That, might I add, is just discretionary spending. I am not including entitlement spending in that mix.

As I understand the numbers on this over the next 5 years, it means the difference between Washington spending \$9.1 trillion versus \$9.0 trillion. It is a \$100 billion difference. A lot of money, \$100 billion, but, in my opinion, this is clearly the right thing to do. I think Washington can tighten its belt a little bit so that the American families can have a little bit more money.

The gentleman was talking about a couple that wants to take a honeymoon. I will tell you what this boils down to for a lot of couples in my Congressional District. It boils down to things like being able to afford braces for the kids; being able to set money aside for college or not; it means new tires for the car or not.

So I say, let us put Washington on a little bit of a diet, and let us give married couples a little bit of a break, and let us pass this. I do commend the gentleman for, again, convening this special order. Twenty-one million American families will be affected by this. That is not a small number of people.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Let me reemphasize the gentleman's last point. When President Clinton was asked what does he think about eliminating the marriage penalty, he agreed that there is no justification for penalizing married people with this marriage tax. But, he said, I am not sure we can find the revenue to be able to do that.

So that has been the prevailing worry in Washington for 30 years. They have let the penalty grow and grow and grow, so that now it is a huge impact on many working families, because they do not want to give up the money.

Our message is, let us do it. Let us eliminate the marriage penalty. Nobody will stand up on the floor of this House and say yes, I like penalizing married couples and they should pay more taxes, because they know it is wrong, but they will not give up the money.

As the gentleman pointed out, it is one cent on the dollar. All we have to do is hold a little bit back. It is not even a cut, because the budget continues to grow at the rate of inflation. It is only a little bit of restraint, and every family in America knows if you are doing something wrong, you have to change your budget priorities, you have to save a little bit here and not spend everything, that you can do that. A 1 percent savings in order to protect families in this country is tremendous.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If the gentleman would yield for a question, now, if I understand the gentleman correctly, we can pass this marriage penalty while actually letting the government continue to grow. The issue just is, how quickly will the Federal budget increase? In other words, are we going to increase at a rate of the inflation rate, or are we going to increase government spending? Am I correct?

Mr. MCINTOSH. That is exactly right. The President's budget, and he said I am not sure we give up the money, increases the rate of government growth at twice the rate of inflation, about 3.5 percent each year. By holding it down to a little bit more than the rate of inflation, which is the Committee on the Budget's proposal, we can have \$100 billion in that budget to eliminate the marriage penalty. I think that is exactly what we need to do.

I had hoped to be able to share with you some of my E-mails, but apparently my computer is not working and we cannot get them printed out. Angie keeps track of all of them in my office for me, but was not able to get them over to me. I would like to emphasize with everybody watching how important this is to average working families in this country.

Now I would like to recognize one of our new Members, a freshman from Pennsylvania who has served many years on the appropriations committee in that chamber, in the Pennsylvania legislature, and he knows you can get the job done in saving money on these appropriations bills if you put your mind to it.

So let me introduce now the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), and recognize the gentleman for a comment on this.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join my colleagues. I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) for his eloquence. I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) for his leadership on this issue. It is a real honor to join the gentlemen this evening to discuss really one of the number one 1998 budget goals for many Members of this Congress, and that is the repeal of the marriage penalty tax.

As many of us have realized, and most Americans I think recognized long ago, the marriage penalty tax works against the very fundamental institution that we claim is the center of our social fabric, the family.

How paradoxical that marriage, the very foundation of our social structure, is currently undermined in our Federal Tax Code. Our current Tax Code, instead of being fair to a husband and wife who both work full-time, places an unnecessary burden on married couples solely for the fact they are married. Under the current code, had this man and woman chosen to live together and file separately, they would not be punished by the Tax Code.

□ 1830

This is just plain wrong, and it is warped.

For instance, in my office alone, within 1 year, I have four staff members getting married. None of these individuals is living with his or her fiancé before they get married.

All eight of these young people are young professionals. All eight of them are paying individual income taxes to the Federal Government. But when these eight individuals choose to wed, when each one of them chooses to become a husband or a wife, automatically, by the very virtue of that decision, they will suffer under the tax status by which they file because they are choosing marriage. They are doing the right thing.

But our Tax Code, in effect, tells them to do something else. If our Tax Code can speak, it would tell them that it is financially better for them if they refrain from making that marriage commitment. Our Tax Code essentially encourages two professional individuals to remain unmarried.

What is the financial cost here? Couples such as those I mentioned will pay an average of \$1,400 a year in higher taxes due to the marriage penalty. In 1996, 21 million married couples were affected. And this must come to an end. So we must press for this budget agreement that includes \$100 billion in tax relief for our married couples.

It is time that our Tax Code reflects this Nation's emphasis on the social virtue and the value of marriage. It is inconceivable that our tax policy should discourage the very fundamental unit of society, family and marriage, but that is what it does.

As our budget negotiations continue, as we seek continued and lasting tax relief for the American people, a repeal of the marriage penalty tax must be part of that mix. What may appear to be a seemingly small penalty hidden within the Tax Code harms in a very large way the institution on which we have based our society, the family.

So elimination of the marriage penalty restores tax fairness. It increases take-home pay for families. It strengthens marriage and families. It helps working women. It is the right thing to do, to repeal the marriage penalty tax.

On the comment in question that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) mentioned previously, if we look historically at the growth of government, the rate of government spending, I think if you will look back 5 years, we have spent about \$7.8 trillion on the Federal Government. Looking ahead for 5 years, it is proposed that we spend \$9.1 trillion.

All we are doing with this marriage penalty tax is just moving that \$9.1 trillion to \$9.0 trillion. In other words, we are just saving 1 penny on the dollar. There is no better way to give tax relief to the American family than to repeal the marriage penalty tax.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, by the way, I would like to mention that the

new freshman class had a budget proposal this year that included addressing this marriage penalty problem. I wanted to thank all of the new Members of Congress for getting behind us.

Oftentimes, the wisdom of some of the new Members gets lost on people who have been here a long time because they get used to spending that money. The gentleman has helped us make that point; that is, 1 penny on the dollar allows us to do what is right for the American family.

One other thing I wanted to point out, I mentioned a letter from my constituents. Sharon Mallory is the one who wrote it to me. I have also said that, in many ways, this tax relief is the working woman's tax relief bill of 1998, because the majority of this penalty ends up going to women who enter the workforce.

Oftentimes, a young lady will get married. She may have a career, put that on hold in order to raise her children. Then, when they get old enough, she wants to have the option of going back into the workforce or, in many cases, has to go back into the workforce just to make ends meet and be able to pay the monthly bills.

When that happens, the marriage penalty kicks in; and, for women, it almost means that they can pay as much as 50 percent or half of the money that they earn in taxes because all of that penalty comes out of her additional income.

So it is often the mothers in this country, the wives, the women who want to work and have a career or need to work to help their family, who are penalized most by this marriage penalty.

We need to recognize in the modern era that it is wrong to say to somebody we will give you equal opportunity to enter the workforce, but we are going to come around and tax you more, as much as 50 percent on your marginal tax rate for your income just because you are married.

A lot of the e-mails that I have received have been from women, mothers, young ladies who are getting married, women who are engaged and looking forward to seeing what will happen once they do get married. They are the ones who are most concerned, and rightfully so, because the incidence of this tax and the unfair burden falls most heavily upon women in this country. We need to eliminate it to allow them to have a chance to keep more of that money and use it for their family.

Other people have pointed out to me that, in some ways, it would allow women to have the choice of maybe working only part-time and spending more time with their children. If they did not have to pay that 50 percent tax on that extra income, they could cut back on their hours and spend more time at home where they would like to spend more time with their children.

So for women who would like to be at home and with their children but feel forced to go into the workplace to

make ends meet and pay the bills, this bill, the marriage tax elimination bill, will also help them make that choice for their families.

Let me now recognize the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) again for another comment.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to stress the point that you were just making, that the burden of this so often does fall to the women, particularly when marriages fail. Much of the consequences of that falls to the women because, frequently, they do end up with the children and they have the added responsibility of raising the kids.

For the government to be establishing and maintaining tax policies that discourage marriage, to me, borders on criminal. The people who, more often than not, pay the real price for this are the wives, the mothers, and obviously the people who are really paying the price are the kids.

I was going through earlier some of the statistics on the impact on children. I have this chart here, and it is really very, very dramatic if you actually look at the numbers: 72 percent of juvenile murderers coming out of broken homes or single-parent homes; 60 percent of rapists; three of four teen suicides; twice as likely to drop out of school.

It has an impact on the parents. The parents have shorter life expectancy, poorer health, lower economic well-being.

Let me just say there are a lot of single moms and single dads who do a great job, and I meet them every day in my district. My hat is off to them, and I applaud them and their work. Many, many great Americans have been raised by very many heroic single parents going it alone; but as any one of them will testify to you, it is much, much harder.

God ordained the two-parent family, and raising kids is just tough. Anybody who has done that knows that is a fact.

I have done some numbers for the impact that this bill has for people in my district. What I did is I looked at a schoolteacher, two schoolteachers. They meet at school in Brevard County where I live in Florida. If they were making \$30,500 a year, they get married, their combined income is \$61,000 a year. So \$30,500 single; they get married, \$61,000.

If they file as singles, they would pay \$3,592 in Federal taxes, for a total of \$7,184. So they are living together out of wedlock, and that is their tax burden. When they get married, when they walk down the aisle, when they go to church and have their marriage blessed, their tax goes up to \$8,563. That is \$1,379 that they will pay as a marriage penalty.

In my opinion, that is obscene to have a Tax Code here in Washington that would actually apply that kind of a penalty on people who do the com-

mon-sense thing of getting married. It is for that reason that I have fought for this. I have supported this.

I just wanted to underscore what we were talking about earlier, because the people who will oppose this will point to all that money that the Federal Government will not get anymore, and they will make these arguments that it is going to hurt the environment or it is going to hurt education or it is going to hurt the elderly or the poor.

The real issue here, the real debate is, is the Federal Government going to grow at double the inflation rate, or is it going to grow at the inflation rate? The inflation rate is about 2 percent, 2.5 percent. There are people here who want to grow the Federal Government at 3½ and 4 percent per year, and they do not want to pass this marriage penalty.

I say, let us pass the marriage penalty, that we can manage business here in Washington with a little less money and give a little more money to working families.

That is such a critical issue here. These are working families, working moms. These are the people who are literally the backbone, the foundation of our country. More often than not, they are trying to raise kids. We are just trying to make it a little bit easier on them.

Yes, we can have the money to protect the environment. We can have the money to pay for programs for the poor and the needy. We can have the money to pay for a national defense and the other needs and still do this.

I see the gentleman from Indiana is going to go into that in a little bit of detail. He has a chart that I think demonstrates that very nicely, so I yield back to him.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, this chart here is something that we produced to show people the differences in spending levels for the various budget proposals that Washington is considering right now.

The President's budget that he introduced earlier this year has government increasing by 3½ percent for 5 years. That is 3½ percent each year for 5 years. It is roughly twice what the rate of inflation is.

By the way, the President did nothing to eliminate the marriage penalty. He says we need the money. We have got to keep penalizing married folks, make them pay more taxes so we can spend that 3½ percent more each year.

The Senate did a little bit better, reduced that down to slightly over 3 percent. They had about \$30 billion from tax cuts. Well, that eliminates one-fifth of the marriage penalty. But people are still paying over four-fifths in the marriage tax each year.

The House budget that JOHN KASICH put out is about 2.7 percent, which is \$100 billion in tax relief. That penny on the dollar, that would allow us to phase out over the 5 years the marriage penalty.

Then the final one is the Conservative Action Team or the CAT's budg-

et. That holds it just under inflation or about 2.6 each year in the rate of growth of government. With that, we are able to have \$150 billion in tax cuts, totally eliminate the marriage penalty this year so that next year on their income tax parents will not be penalized because they are married anymore.

Those are the choices. What is at stake right now is how we are negotiating with these different parties. But it is very clear the President is for more government spending and keeping the marriage penalty. The Senate is for splitting the difference, still having some marriage penalty, but spending a lot of money for the Federal Government. The House is for eliminating the marriage penalty, and that is what we are going to be voting on later this year.

While we were listening to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), Angie was able to get the computer to work, and I have got some of these e-mails that I wanted to share with you just to show exactly what people around the country are saying about this marriage tax penalty.

The first one is from Christopher Schleifer who is from Fairfield, Ohio. Christopher writes: One of the biggest shocks my wife and I had when we decided to get married was how much more we would have to give the government because we decided to be married rather than live together. It does not make sense that I was allowed to keep a larger portion of my pay on Friday and less of it on Monday with the only difference being that I was married over the weekend.

□ 1845

Another e-mail came in from Wayne in Dayton, Ohio. He said,

Penalizing for marriage flies in the face of common sense. This is a classic example of government policy not supporting that which it tries to promote. In our particular situation, my girlfriend and I would incur a net annual penalty of \$2,000, or approximately \$167 per month. Though not huge, this is enough to pay our monthly phone, cable, water, and home insurance bills.

That was from Wayne in Dayton, Ohio.

Then Thomas Smith, from Columbus, said,

I am engaged to be married, and my fiance and I have discussed the fact that we will be penalized financially. We have postponed the date of our marriage in order to save up and have a "running start," in part because of this nasty, unfair tax structure.

Then I have one from Thana and Emily in Everett, Washington. They write,

My wife and I support McIntosh's bill 100 percent. I'd like to use the money that we could save for my 1-year-old daughter's college fund. My wife and I have made a commitment to one another that I work to pay bills and she works to pay taxes. It is not that funny, but we don't have any other choice but to just laugh it off.

I am hoping, Thana and Emily, that this House will pass the Marriage Tax Elimination Act so you can have a little bit extra for your 1-year-old daughter.

Finally, I wanted to share with Members a part of an e-mail from Andrew and Connie Barrington from Alexandria, Virginia.

We grew up together and began dating when we were 18. After dating for 3 years, we decided that the next natural step in our lives together would be to get married. I cannot tell you the joy that this has brought, but I must tell you that the tax penalty that was inflicted on us has been the only real source of pain that our marriage has suffered. Thank you for all you are doing to eliminate this horrible punishment for fulfilling our lives together.

Well, Andrew and Connie, it is my fondest hope that we will act this year. We will overcome the President's reluctance, we will overcome the Senate's shyness about eliminating the tax, and we will be able to say to you next year, no longer are you penalized on your taxes just because you are married.

I think it is critical that this House also make a resolution in the budget to hold the line on the spending in order to get there. In 1994 when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and I were first elected, the biggest difference between a Republican and a Democrat Congress was that we said we wanted to shrink the size of government. We have worked hard and we have balanced the budget. We have not shrunk it yet, but at least we are holding the line on spending.

This year, if we can hold that line to just under the rate of inflation or just around the rate of inflation, we can eliminate this unfair marriage penalty, allow everybody to pay the same, whether they are married or single, strengthen families, give the typical family in America more money out of their paycheck, so they can make for themselves the decision on how to spend that money, whether to save it for their children, for their college funds, whether to pay their cable bill, whether to get the braces, whether to go on a vacation this year.

All of those decisions should be left to the family. We want to end the fights that people have because they do not have enough money to pay the bills each month. One of the biggest reasons is the government takes more and more and more out of married people's payroll in taxes. I hope, and I think we have come farther than ever before, that this House will come together and eliminate this marriage penalty.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), and would ask if he has any further remarks to make on this.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just wanted to close out my contribution to this special order to say how pleased I am to see us moving in this direction, and that we may be able to pass the repeal of the marriage penalty.

Many people ask me, how did you get into politics? You are a doctor, and most doctors do not go into politics. The way I got involved in it is I actually started a community group in the

county that I live in called the Space Coast Family Forum. We call it the Space Coast because we launch the shuttle there, and as well, the Titan and Atlas rockets, and many may have seen the shuttle launch we had yesterday. It was a beautiful launch.

But we formed that group, myself and other people, because of our concern about the breakdown of the family in the United States. I felt very strongly, as do the others who helped me join together to form that group, that the family was the foundation upon which our society was based. It was really strong families that made for strong communities that made for strong States and nations. It was not great policies that emanate from the Capitol in Washington, D.C., but it was just strong communities that really made a difference.

One of the reasons I went further and ran myself, and became a candidate, and got elected, is I wanted to be able to come here and make a difference, and to do something to help families, to help working families. I am very pleased to see that we are heading in this direction. The President has made statements to indicate that he will support this. I am very pleased that the Committee on the Budget has incorporated provisions to allow for the end of the marriage penalty in this. I am very pleased to be able to support the gentleman and those others who have been involved with this effort.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, for the closing portion of our special order, and I think we have about 10 minutes more, I will yield to one of my colleagues who has worked tremendously on the CATS budget, the Conservative Action Team budget.

As I mentioned earlier, using one of the charts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. NEUMANN), the President spends more and does nothing to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. The Senate spends a little less but keeps most of the marriage penalty. The House does eliminate the marriage penalty, and then the CATS budget keeps the budget under the rate of inflation, so we can totally eliminate the marriage penalty, plus have some tax cuts to spur job growth and save Social Security.

One of the reasons we have been able to do this is that one of our colleagues, a fellow who also came in with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) and me in 1994, has worked tirelessly to study this budget to find out where we are spending too much money, where we are wasting taxpayers' dollars, where we can do a better job of holding back on this rate of growth in order to fulfill our promises of smaller government, lower taxes, saving Social Security, and returning our national defense to its proper place.

I yield the balance of the time on this special order to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK NEUMANN), one of the people in this House who has made a big impact on this budget.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will point to the chart once more, point to the line of inflation in the President's budget, and then go up to where he is actually spending. The real question is, would we rather spend that extra money out here in Washington, in Washington-run programs, or would we be better off leaving that money in the pockets and hands of the people who earned the money in the first place? That is what this really is all about.

The marriage tax penalty is one of those commonsense issues in this country that makes people so angry out there in America. It is one of those issues, when you go to people and say, did you know that if four people work at the same job, they earn exactly the same money, and two of them are married to each other and two are living together, that the two that are living together pay less taxes than the two that are married to each other? People just go, why would we do that? What kind of government would allow that to happen? It is a commonsense kind of thing.

Then we would look at that chart and say, we could continue more Washington spending programs, have more spending going on in this community. The President has some ideas on how to start some new programs. He has laid out a whole list of new spending programs. That is what the distance from that black line that is the inflationary level up to where he is actually spending is. That is what that extra is, new spending programs that are going to be started here in Washington.

We could do that, if that is what we wanted to do. But we had Kelly Ann Fitzpatrick, a pollster here in Washington, a well-respected pollster out here, she went out and asked 2,000 Americans, she said, do you think government spending should go up faster than the rate of inflation, at the rate of inflation, or slower than the rate of inflation? And it was a 90 to 3 question. Ninety percent of the people said at or below the rate of inflation. Only 3 percent thought that government spending should go up faster than the rate of inflation.

I cannot emphasize enough what we are really talking about here is should we spend more of that hard-earned money out here in Washington, or should we leave that money in the pockets of the American people? I do not know if the gentleman mentioned earlier in the hour about the tax cuts that have already passed.

I think there is very little understanding in this country that when we look at what we have already passed, because of the savings we have been able to enact so far, things like \$400 per child, 550,000 Wisconsin families next April when they figure out their taxes, they will get down to how much they

would have paid in taxes to Washington, and subtract \$400 off the bottom line for the \$400 per child tax credit.

This is just common sense. Who can spend this money better? I believe that our Wisconsin families can spend it better than the people out here in Washington.

Or the college tuition, I have two in college myself. I know a lot of our middle-income families that are struggling to pay college tuition bills. When they struggle to pay these college tuition bills, we looked at this picture and said, they earned \$1,500. Would it not be nice if in the middle-income families, they could keep the \$1,500 to help pay for college tuition, instead of sending to Washington?

I believe those 250,000 Wisconsin families and others like them all across America can spend that \$1,500 better to help their kids go to college than the bureaucrats could if they got their hands on the money here in Washington. That is what this is all about.

Take capital gains. I have been having a lot of fun, and I do not know if my colleague from Indiana has been doing this. I have been asking when I am out in groups, how many own a stock, bond, or mutual fund? What I have been finding is that almost every single hand in the room has gone up. The number of people in America today who own stocks, bonds, mutual funds, or some sort of retirement plan like that is astronomical.

Then I say, well, shoot, I hope you earn a profit on it. I really hope you make a profit on your investment, because this is America. After all, is that not why you are investing? They all nod their head. When you make a profit, instead of sending \$28 out of every hundred you now make in profit, you now only send \$20, because our government has reeled in the growth of spending. It is still growing at the rate of inflation, like that chart shows, but we have reeled it in and stopped it from growing faster than the rate of inflation, so when you make a profit you do not have to send as much out here to Washington. That is just common sense.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, the amazing thing about that is as we have cut that tax by almost one-third, people are investing more in stocks and bonds and mutual funds, as the gentleman said, and as a result, the government is actually receiving more money with lower taxes.

Ronald Reagan was right: If we cut taxes, people will engage in more economic activity, and the government will actually receive the revenues it needs to do its business. I am glad the gentleman brought that up as a key part of what we have been doing here.

Mr. NEUMANN. The other one I like to talk about is the death and estate tax. We pay taxes on this money once. We go all through our lives, build up this estate. Would it not be nice if we got to the point in America again where we could pass this estate to our

kids instead of giving it to the government?

I hope every American has the right to build their estate while they are living. I hope they are successful. I really do. That is what this country is all about. When we look forward to the next generation, I hope there are a lot of successful people out there. I think every American citizen should have the right to pass their estate on to their children, rather than to the United States government.

We have a long ways to go on the estate tax, but we did take the first shot last year. It is better than it used to be, at least. A lot of progress is being made. When we really look at this picture, it comes down to the question of whether Washington should spend the money, or should the people who earned the money keep it in their homes and families and do a better job of spending?

Mr. MCINTOSH. Let us look back at this chart again. I would ask the gentleman to explain to our colleagues and to Americans watching tonight, when we hold the line on the spending, and instead of going to 3.5 percent increases each year we just keep it to inflation, which the CATS budget does, the gentleman was also able to write into that budget some tremendous help for Social Security.

Would the gentleman share for us exactly what the difference is? The President spends the money on government programs that are supposed to go into the Social Security trust fund, and the gentleman has been able to write it so we actually actually put the money aside to be there for the senior citizens.

Mr. NEUMANN. That is an important part of the CATS budget. It spends less and it can provide more tax relief. It also provides more money set aside to preserve and protect Social Security than any of the other three budgets under consideration out here. We actually set aside all of the money that is coming in above and beyond what we are actually paying back out to seniors in benefits. We should be very clear on this.

Right now, today, with us baby boomers still in the work force, there is more money coming in for Social Security than what we are actually paying back out to our senior citizens in benefits. Today the government takes that money and spends it on other government programs and puts IOUs in the trust fund.

Under the CATS budget, that extra cash that is coming in for Social Security this year, over and above what is being paid back out to seniors, actually gets set aside in real money. We buy negotiable Treasury bonds and put them into the Social Security trust fund. It is very different than any other proposal out here at this time. It is really the right way to make sure that my mother's Social Security is safe in the near term.

We hear a lot of people talking about Social Security post 2030. The real

problem in Social Security is not 2030, it is 2012. In 2012, we have more money going out to seniors in benefits. That is when the baby boom generation reaches retirement, and there are a lot of us racing towards retirement.

When the baby boom generation gets to retirement, there is more money going out than dollars coming in. That is when we are supposed to be able to go to the savings account trust fund, take the money, and make good on our Social Security promise.

The CATS budget actually puts real money into the savings account, so when 2012 gets here and we need the money, we can go to the savings account and make good on Social Security without raising taxes on the hard-working people in this country.

Mr. MCINTOSH. One other important point that I think is so important to stress on the gentleman's budget is that we have also been able to take care of the problem in defense.

We now realize, with China developing the technology to deliver nuclear weapons, not only to Hawaii but all across the United States, with India testing a nuclear weapon and Pakistan testing a nuclear weapon, that the world is a dangerous place.

□ 1900

Now, after the Cold War was over, we held our defense spending even, which meant with inflation we were actually going down each year in real terms. But because we held the line on everything else to just below inflation, we were able to raise defense up to the level of inflation over the 5 years. And I was going to have the gentleman share more with people how we were able to do that.

Mr. NEUMANN. Well, this is a reprioritizing of how we are spending the taxpayers' money. We can spend it on any one of a number of programs out here. We simply said, look, if the rest of the budget is going to be allowed to increase at the rate of inflation, we want our defense spending to increase at the rate of inflation too.

Everybody out here called that an increase. They call it cuts when we are actually spending much more than the rate of inflation. They call it an increase when we are only letting it go up at the rate of inflation. It is a very strange community when we start thinking about the actual language.

I had this discussion as a matter of fact with a well-respected reporter from Milwaukee, Wisconsin. And I mean it. He is a good reporter from the community of Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and we had this discussion.

My opponent was talking to me about how we were increasing spending by \$9 billion in defense. I took out the numbers. Our first year here we spent \$272 billion on defense. We are now spending \$264 billion. We spent \$272 billion the first year; we are now spending \$264 billion.

Now in Wisconsin we would call that a decrease in spending, but that is not

what they call it. They call it an increase. Let me explain why that is an increase in spending, even though spending went down from \$272 billion to \$264 billion.

The President only requested \$255 billion. So when we spent \$264 billion, they called that an increase over what the President requested even though it was a decrease. And if listeners are not confused yet, I will give more numbers. But the facts are it gets twisted when one tries to listen to people in this community.

The bottom line in the CATS budget, defense spending is frozen in real dollars. That is to say, it is allowed to increase at the rate of inflation, and this is the only budget on the Hill that actually allows for inflationary increase in defense spending.

There are people out there that bought \$75 hammers and \$200 toilet seats. We ought to can those people. We ought to fire those people today. The people responsible for the waste in the military ought to be booted out and booted out right now.

But that does not mean that because of those few we should place our men and women in uniform in jeopardy, and that is what has been going on out here. They have been demagoguing it based on the few people who are making the horrible mistakes and wasting the defense dollars, and the result is that our young men and women in uniform are being put in jeopardy.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, with that let me yield back the balance of our time and urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes" on the CATS budget and support the elimination of the marriage penalty.

COMMEMORATING THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAJO TREATY OF 1868

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. REDMOND) is recognized for 10 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. REDMOND. Mr. Speaker, 1998 is a very significant year in the history of the Navajo Nation. It is the 130th anniversary of the signing of the treaty between the Navajo people and the United States Government.

In honor of this 130th anniversary, this week I will be reading segments of the treaty until it has been read in full and people in America know what the treaty contains and what the agreement is between the government of the United States and the Navajo people. The treaty begins like this:

Andrew Johnson, President of the United States of America, ALL AND SINGULAR TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME, GREETING:

Whereas a Treaty was made in Fort Sumner, in the Territory of New Mexico, on the first day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight, by and between Lieutenant General W.T. Sherman and Samuel F. Tappan, Commissioners,

on behalf of the United States of America, and Barboncito, Armijo, and other Chiefs and Headmen of the Navajo tribes of Indians, on the part of said Indians, and duly authorized thereto by them, which Treaty is in the words and figures following, to wit:

Articles of a Treaty and agreement made and entered into at Fort Sumner, New Mexico, on the first day of June, 1868, by and between the United States, represented by its Commissioners, Lieutenant General W.T. Sherman and Colonel Samuel F. Tappan, of the one part, and the Navajo Nation or tribes of Indians, represented by their Chiefs and Headmen, duly authorized and empowered to act for the whole people of said Nation or tribe, (the names of said Chiefs and Headmen being hereto subscribed,) of the other part, witness:

Article I. From this day forward all war between the parties to this agreement shall for ever cease. The government of the United States desires peace, and its honor is thereby pledged to keep it. The Indians desire peace, and they now pledge their honor to keep it.

If bad men among the whites, or among other people subject to the authority of the United States, shall commit any wrong upon the person or property of the Indians, the United States will, upon proof made to the agent and forwarded to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at Washington city, proceed at once to cause the offender to be arrested and punished according to the laws of the United States, and also to reimburse the injured persons for the loss sustained.

If bad men among the Indians shall commit a wrong or depredation upon the person or property of any one, white, black, or Indian, subject to the authority of the United States and at peace therewith, the Navajo tribe agree that they will, on proof made to their agent, and on notice by him, deliver up the wrongdoer to the United States, to be tried and punished according to its laws; and in case they willfully refuse to do so, the person injured shall be reimbursed for his loss for the annuities or other moneys due or to become due them under this Treaty, or any others that may be made with the United States. And the President may prescribe such rules and regulations for ascertains damages under this article as in his judgment may be proper; but no such damage shall be adjusted and paid until examined and passed upon by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and no one sustaining loss whilst violating, or because of his violating, the provisions of this treaty or the laws of the United States shall be reimbursed therefore.

Article II. The United States agrees that the following district of country, to wit: bounded on the north by the 37th degree of north latitude, south by an east and west line passing through the site of old Fort Defiance, in Canon Bonito, east of the parallel of longitude which, if prolonged south, would pass through old Fort Lyon, or the Ojo-de-oso, Bear Spring, and west by a parallel of longitude about 109 degrees and 30 minutes west of Greenwich, provided it embraces the outlet of Canon-de-Chilly, which canon is to be all included in this reservation, shall be, and the same is hereby, set apart for the use and occupation of the Navajo tribe of Indians, and for such other friendly tribes or individual Indians as from time to time they may be willing, with the consent of the United States, to admit among them; and the United States agrees that no persons except those herein authorized to do so, and except such officers, soldiers, agents, and employees of the government, or of the Indians, as may be authorized to enter upon Indian reservations in discharge of duties imposed by law, or the orders of the President, shall ever be permitted to pass over, settle upon,

or reside in, the territory described in this article.

Article III. The United States agrees to cause to be built at some point within said reservation, where timber and water may be convenient, the following buildings: a warehouse, to cost not exceeding twenty-five hundred dollars; an agency building for the residence of the agent, not to cost exceeding three thousand dollars; a carpenter shop and blacksmith shop, not to cost exceeding one thousand dollars each; and a school-house and chapel, so soon as sufficient number of children can be induced to attend school, which shall not cost to exceed five thousand dollars.

Article IV. The United States agrees that the agent for the Navajos shall make his home at the agency building; that he shall reside among them and shall keep an office at all times for the purpose of prompt and diligent inquiry into such matters of complaint by or against the Indians as may be presented for investigation, as also for the faithful discharge of other duties enjoined by law. In all cases of depredation on person or property shall cause the evidence to be taken in writing and forwarded, together with his finding, to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, whose decision shall be binding on the parties to this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for allowing me this time to read once again the Treaty between the Navajo Nation and the United States Government, the Treaty of 1868, Articles I, II, and III. We will continue to read on a sequential basis the rest of the articles of this Treaty, but the purpose of this is to celebrate the 130th anniversary of peace between the Navajo people and the people of the United States.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2604, THE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AND CHARITABLE DONATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her kindness. I realize how important an issue we have to discuss in just a few minutes, and I wanted to add my support and respect for the importance of legislation that we just discussed here on the House floor just a short while ago.

One in particular, H.R. 2604, the Religious Liberty and Charitable Donation Act, particularly comes to mind as we are poised for some other discussions dealing with the First Amendment and, as well, religious liberty.

This bill is a bill that must and should have been passed, for it recognizes and respects the freedom of religion, and it was captured in the words of Judge Alphonzo Taft, father of President Howard Taft:

The ideal of our people as to religious freedom is absolute equality under the law of all religious opinions and sects . . . the government is neutral and while protecting all, it prefers none and disparages none.

This legislation protects donations to charities and to one's religious institution in the form of tithe or offering,